REMARKS

These Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed August 21, 2007. Claims 16-25 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. Claims 16-25 remain for the Examiner's consideration. Examiner Ke is thanked for conducting an interview with the Applicant on Wednesday September 19, 2007 at 9 AM PST.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 16-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lincke et al. U.S. Patent No. US 6,397,259 (hereinafter '259), in view of Polonsky et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,072,984 (hereinafter '984).

The Applicant points out that the current application is a continuation of application No. 09/612,806 filed on July 10, 2000 (now Patent No. 6,670,968). '984 was filed April 25, 2001 claiming priority to a provisional application 60/199,858 (hereinafter '858) filed April 25 2000. As such, '984 is entitled to an earlier priority date only for that which was disclosed in the '858 provisional application.

Claim 16

Examiner Watt stated that '259 "does not teach a web page containing links, or extracting and providing links for viewing" (page 2, point 4, second paragraph, last sentence). Examiner Watt previously relied upon '984 for teaching "a web page containing both content and links, extracting the links from the web page, said extracting

performed without receiving further input from a user, and providing the links separately from the content for viewing on the display" (page 3, last paragraph – page 4, lines 1-2). In support of this the Examiner directed the Applicant to Figure 12 of '984. Figure 12 of '984 (see column 275, lines 3-10) is a screen shot of a browser showing the 'http://www.yahoo.com' web page. However, '858 does not contain a Figure 12. A word search of the '858 application indicates that 'yahoo' occurs a number of times in three separate places (i) in an 'Example' (page 13), (ii) in 'Normalization Overview' (page 17), and (iii) in pages titled 'Figure 5' and captioned 'SAMPLE ALGORITHM OUTPUT' (pages 23-27). None of these three groups of occurrences can be said to teach or suggest a web page containing both content and links, extracting the links from the web page, said extracting performed without receiving further input from a user, and providing the links separately from the content for viewing on the display.

During the interview, Examiner Ke conceded that '858 does not have a Figure 12. However, the Examiner stated that '858 implicitly taught or suggested a web page containing both 'content' and 'links' and extracting links without receiving further input from the user. During the interview, the Examiner directed the Applicant to the example on page 13 of '858 (lines 5-9) as implicitly suggesting that both content and links are extracted. The Applicant stated that the example on page 13 of '858 does not teach or suggest to a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made the limitations "extracting the links from the content of the Web page, said extracting performed without receiving further input from a user; and providing the links separately from the content for viewing on the display". Since '259 and '858 do not teach or suggest "extracting the links from the content of the Web page, said extracting performed

without receiving further input from a user", the cited references do not teach or suggest all limitations of the claim. (MPEP 2143.03). As such, Claim 16 was not obvious at the time the invention was made

Further the Applicant and Examiner discussed the importance of the discussion on 'Infospeed Normalization and Presentation Layers' on page 17 of '858. The Examiner argued that the reference to "[t]he User than (sic) walks the DOM tree for specific information required", implies that the DOM tree displayed both content and links (Normalization Overview, 3rd paragraph, 2nd sentence, '858). The Applicant respectfully requested that the Examiner cite to an explicit teaching or suggestion that the DOM tree extracts the links without receiving further input from the user; and provides the links separately from the content. In response, the Examiner directed the Applicant to Figures 10 and 13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,300,947. The Applicant notes that this patent was not cited in the rejection and respectfully requests that the Examiner officially introduce the reference into the record. "In order to provide a complete application file history and to enhance the clarity of the prosecution history record, an examiner must provide clear explanations of all actions taken by the examiner during prosecution of an application". MPEP 707.07(f).

The Examiner also cited to '984 for "motivation to combine Polonsky into Lincke to provide means by which the user can more conveniently access web page information ..." (col 2, line 65). The text at column 2, line 65 of '984 is "[i]n another aspect of the present embodiment, a normalizer". However, a word search of the '858 indicates the word 'normalizer' is not present. Thus, the Applicant respectfully concludes that '858

cannot be relied upon for the required motivation to combine by a person having ordinary skill in the art.

Claim 17

With regard to claim 17, Examiner Watt relied upon '984 for teaching "providing only one of the links identifying the single destination to the display (i.e. compare "TEMPLATE EXISTS FOR DOCUMENT" and "TEMPLATE MATCHES" in Fig 10 et seq of Polonsky)". The Applicant respectfully points out that Figure 10 was not present in '858, nor do any of the Figures or the text contain the word 'Template'. Since '259 and '858 do not teach or suggest " providing only one of the links identifying the single destination to the display", the cited references do not teach or suggest all limitations of the claim. (MPEP 2143.03). As such, Claim 17 was not obvious at the time the invention was made.

Claim 18-23 and 25

With regard to claims 18-23 and 25, Examiner Watt relied upon the '984 patent for the limitations in these claims and cites to Figure 12 for support for these limitations in '984. However, Examiner Ke admitted that Figure 12 of '984 is not present in '858. Since '259 and '858 do not teach or suggest the limitations of claims 18-23 and 25, the cited references do not teach or suggest all limitations of the claim. (MPEP 2143.03). As such, Claims 18-23 and 25 were not obvious at the time the invention was made.

<u>Claim 24</u>

Claim 24 directly depends from independent Claim 16, and is therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent Claim 16 and because of the additional limitations of this claim.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 103(a) rejection.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully requested that all outstanding rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: <u>November 28, 2007</u>   By: <u>/Anthony G. Craig/</u>
Anthony G. Craig
Reg. No. 50,342

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer Number 23910